



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 September 2023 by R Parker BSc (Hons)

Decision by S Edwards MA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/23/3325587

357 Wimbledon Park Road, Wandsworth, London SW19 6NS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Sophia Browning against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2023/1567, dated 24 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 22 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Replace existing main roof to afford a better internal arrangement complete with a recessed, east facing balcony. Alterations to the roof design of existing ground floor single story extension. Shallow single story ground floor side extension.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

1. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Government published on 5 September 2023 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy as a material consideration, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.
3. Wandsworth Local Plan 2023 - 2038 (the Local Plan) was adopted on 19 July 2023. The new Local Plan replaces the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (Adopted March 2016) and the policies contained within it. Accordingly, I will consider the appeal against the most up-to-date policies, on which the parties have had the opportunity to comment during the appeal process.
4. The appeal under consideration has been proposed by the appellant after the Council's refusal of a previous, similar, application. In this proposal, the appellant has sought to overcome the Council's previous concerns with regard to the roof pitch on the principal elevation facing Wimbledon Park Road.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal property is a well-proportioned two-storey dwelling, prominently positioned on a corner plot. It has some similarities in design with its immediate neighbours but is distinguished by its characterful roof and differing window style. The character and appearance of the surrounding area is typified by properties of varied style and age. The dwelling has a hipped roof, with two small dormers on the southern slope and a larger box dormer on the northern slope. This is a pleasant building, which is clearly defined by its elegant proportions and its architecturally distinctive roof form.
7. The proposed development is for a combination of alterations to the roof and for the formalisation and extension of the current ground floor lean-to, to be tied in with an existing single-storey extension. Roof alterations would comprise a variety of changes to its form, resulting in a crown roof appearance.
8. The design and scale of the proposed roof alterations would not align with the existing character of the building, because the original roof form would no longer be identifiable. As a result, the existing character of the dwelling would be harmfully altered. The presence of protruding bay windows and turret would not counteract the undue prominence of the proposed roof design. This design would alter the proportions of the host property, giving it a top-heavy appearance and detracting from its historic character. Therefore, despite the use of suitable materials, the proposed alterations would, by reason of their inappropriate design and excessive scale, be harmful to the character and appearance of the property.
9. The appellant cites similarities between the host property and that at 359 Wimbledon Park Road as creating a pair, giving a 'bookend' appearance. They explain that this proposal has been designed to increase physical integration with this and other properties surrounding the host dwelling. However, while there are some similarities between them, the proportions and architectural detailing of the two buildings are too different to be perceived as a pair. Furthermore, in this instance the prevailing character of the surroundings is one of stylistic diversity rather than integration. The dwelling in its distinctive current form is an important part of this diversity – a contribution which would be harmfully eroded were the proposed roof alterations to go ahead.
10. The proposed roof extension would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surrounding area. Consequently, it would not accord with Policies LP1 and LP5 of the Local Plan. These Policies require developments and extensions to respond positively to local character and to that of the host dwelling, while remaining visually subservient.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has cited some examples of roof conversions within the borough. However, they are not within the immediate locality of the host dwelling and I do not have the full details of the cases before me. I cannot be certain that the circumstances of these cases represent a direct parallel with the proposal in question. Therefore, I have given very limited weight to these examples.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. No concerns have been raised by the Council regarding the proposed single storey extension and there are no reasons for me to disagree with their view. It would be a minor alteration to the appearance of the property and remain subservient to the host building. I also note that the appeal scheme would create additional residential accommodation in the roof. However, the harm caused to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area by the proposed roof development would outweigh these considerations.
13. There are no material considerations indicating that the appeal scheme should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Parker

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the recommendation. The proposed roof extension would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area. On that basis, the appeal is dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR